

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In this non-final Action, the Examiner indicated claims 3, 10, and 17 to contain allowable subject matter. In response, applicants have placed claims 3, 10, and 17 in independent form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-9, 12-16, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. patent no. 6,556,984 (Zien et al.) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,401,084 (Ortega et al.). In response, claims 2, 6, and 7 have been made dependent from allowable claim 3. Claims 9, 13, and 14 have been made dependent from allowable claim 10. And, claims 16, 20, and 21 have been made dependent from allowable claim 17. Since these claims depend from allowable claims, they are likewise allowable. Applicants have canceled claims 1, 8, and 15, thereby making their rejection moot. Furthermore, applicants have placed claims 5, 12, and 19 in independent form and have amended them to recite the claimed invention with greater specificity. The rejection of claims 5, 12, and 19 as amended is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 12, and 19 as amended recite that “the character corresponding to the individual column of the grid of the present computation text and the character corresponding to the column of the previous computation text are both the same character and not a part of a prefix shared by the previous computation text and the present computation text” (emphasis added). In the illustrative example of Fig. 4, these recitations correspond to the character “t” in “distance” and “diphthong”, and do not correspond to the characters “d” or “i.” Consequently, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, these recitations do not correspond to the teaching of Zien et al. as modified by the teaching of Ortega et al. The teachings of Zien et al. referenced by the Examiner relate only to common-path portions of the source and target strings that are a prefix of both of those strings. There is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Zien et al., either alone or as modified by Ortega et al., that

suggests reuse of columns corresponding to string portions that are not a common prefix.

Consequently, the disclosures of Zien et al. and Ortega et al. do not render unpatentable claims 5, 12, and 19 as amended. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 5, 12, and 19 as amended be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 11, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zien et al. in view of Ortega et al. and U.S. patent no. 5,778,361 (Nanjo et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have placed claims 4, 11, and 18 in independent form. These claims recite using the alternative list of texts "in response to the search string lacking all characters in said set of characters" that have been replaced by the determined character, but using the original list of texts "in response to the search string not lacking all characters in said set". In contrast, and contrary to the Examiner's assertion, in the applied references there is no teaching or suggestion of conditioning which list of texts is used upon whether or not the search string lacks or does not lack the characters of the replaced set of characters. Nanjo et al. disclose that all katakana and roman strings are normalized (col. 13, lines 14-15) before indexing (col. 13, lines 21-23). Thus, whether original or normalized text is indexed and searched depends only upon the character content of that text itself, and not on the character content of a search string that is applied to the text. Col. 13, lines 25-60 of Nanjo et al. (the passage referenced by the Examiner for this proposition) does not suggest using either normalized text or original text depending upon the character content of a search string, nor is such a suggestion found anywhere else in Nanjo et al. or in any of the other references applied by the Examiner.

It should therefore be evident that the applied references do not render claims 4, 11, and 18 unpatentable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 4, 11, and 18 be withdrawn.

Applicants have taken this opportunity to add new claims 22-39. These claims correspond to, e.g., claims 2, 6, and 7, but depend from different independent claims.

The Examiner's rejections having been properly responded to and overcome, applicants suggest that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore request that the application be reconsidered and thereafter be passed to issue.

Although the foregoing is believed to be dispositive of all issues in the application, if the Examiner should deem that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution, he is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**Eric T. Bax**  
**Ian Swett**

By   
David Volejnicek  
Corporate Counsel  
Reg. No. 29355  
303-538-4154

Date: 11 Dec. 2007

Avaya Inc.  
Docket Administrator  
307 Middletown-Lincroft Road  
Room 1N-391  
Lincroft, NJ 07738